REMARKS

Claims 1-34 are pending in the present application.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-6, 9-18, 21-28 and 31-34 under U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by US patent Publication No. 2003/0005118 to Williams (hereinafter simply "Williams"). The Examiner has also rejected claims 7, 8, 19, 20, 29 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams in view of US Patent No. 5,907,621 to Bachman *et al.* (hereinafter simply "Bachman").

Williams does appear to disclose redirecting a request from a first server to a second server (a login server), but does not appear to disclose that the redirecting includes transmitting a session token <u>to a second server</u> as required by claim 1.

At paragraph 1 on page 3 of the Office Action of June 1, 2007, the Examiner points to lines 12-18 of paragraph [0067] where Williams merely provides a general definition of a redirect as allowing "a server to respond to a client request with instructions to load a resource at a different location". Williams sets out that "most browsers will automatically request the new resource in response to a redirect". Further, Williams specifies that "When the browser receives the HTTP redirect, <u>the browser</u> issues a new HTTP Request using the redirected URI provided in the HTTP redirect". A good example of this type of redirection is when a website's address is changed to a new address – when a request is made to the server for the old website, the server responds and provides a new location to the browser. The browser, upon receiving the response from the server providing the new location, will issue a new HTTP Request using the redirected URI (location) provided in the HTTP Redirect. Most browsers will automatically redirect the client to the new location.

2

The important difference to note is that in Williams, it is submitted that there is no disclosure of the transmission of a session token from a first server to a second server.

Perhaps to illustrate that a server in Williams may, as required by claim 1, receive a request accompanied by an encrypted session token, which it is submitted that Williams does not otherwise disclose, the Examiner has cited a passage in paragraph [0051] of Williams that reads, "the entities within the network may share or synchronize cryptographic keys as appropriate in accordance with many well-known manners in the prior art." It is submitted that the cited passage teaches away from the method of claim 1. If the first server and the second server of claim 1 share or synchronize cryptographic keys, then there is no requirement for the first server to decrypt an encrypted session token, received with a request, before transmitting the session token to the second server a required by Claim 1.

Since it is submitted that Williams does not suggest or disclose transmitting a session token, received along with a request, to a second server, it is further submitted that the method of claim 1 is not anticipated by Williams. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 1, and Claims 2-6 and 9-12 dependent, either directly or indirectly, thereon, as anticipated by Williams.

Claim 13 is directed to a system for secure session management. The system of claim 13 includes a first server including a first request handler. Claim 13 requires that the first request handler transmit a session token to a second server. Further to the discussion above, it is submitted that Williams does not suggest or disclose a first request handler transmitting a session token, received along with a request, to a second server. Accordingly, it is submitted that the system of claim 13 is not

3

anticipated by Williams. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 13, and Claims 14-18 dependent, either directly or indirectly, thereon, as anticipated by Williams.

Claim 23 is directed to a computer program product having a computer-readable medium tangibly embodying computer executable instructions for secure session management. The computer program product of claim 23 includes computer executable instructions for transmitting a session token to a second server. Further to the discussion above, it is submitted that Williams does not suggest or disclose computer executable instructions for transmitting a session token, received along with a request, to a second server. Accordingly, it is submitted that the computer program product of claim 23 is not anticipated by Williams. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 23, and Claims 24-28 and 31-34 dependent, either directly or indirectly, thereon, as anticipated by Williams.

The Examiner has rejected claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams in view of Bachman. Claims 7 and 8 depend indirectly from claim 1 and add limitations. The Examiner contends that Williams discloses most of the subject matter of claims 7 and 8 and cites Bachman to illustrate that the additional limitations added by claims 7 and 8 were known at the time the claimed inventions was made. Without regard to whether Bachman discloses the limitations added by claims 7 and 8, it is submitted that Bachman does not suggest or disclose transmitting a session token to a second server as required by claim 1.

Since it is submitted that neither Williams nor Bachman, nor a combination of Williams and Bachman suggest or disclose transmitting a session token, received along with a request, to a second server, it is further submitted that the method of claims 7 and 8 are patentable over Williams in view of Bachman. It is respectfully

4

requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 7 and 8 as obvious.

The Examiner has rejected claims 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams in view of Bachman. Claims 19 and 20 depend indirectly from claim 13 and add limitations. The Examiner contends that Williams discloses most of the subject matter of claims 19 and 20 and cites Bachman to illustrate that the additional limitations added by claims 19 and 20 were known at the time the claimed inventions was made. Without regard to whether Bachman discloses the limitations added by claims 19 and 20, it is submitted that Bachman does not suggest or disclose a first request handler transmitting a session token, received along with a request, to a second server, as required by claim 13.

Since it is submitted that neither Williams nor Bachman, nor a combination of Williams and Bachman suggest or disclose a first request handler transmitting a session token, received along with a request, to a second server, it is further submitted that the system of claims 19 and 20 are patentable over Williams in view of Bachman. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 19 and 20 as obvious.

The Examiner has rejected claims 29 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams in view of Bachman. Claims 29 and 30 depend indirectly from claim 23 and add limitations. The Examiner contends that Williams discloses most of the subject matter of claims 29 and 30 and cites Bachman to illustrate that the additional limitations added by claims 29 and 30 were known at the time the claimed inventions was made. Without regard to whether Bachman discloses the limitations added by claims 29 and 30, it is submitted that Bachman does not suggest or disclose computer executable instructions for transmitting a session token, received along with a request, to a second server, as required by claim 23.

Since it is submitted that neither Williams nor Bachman, nor a combination of Williams and Bachman suggest or disclose computer executable instructions for transmitting a session token, received along with a request, to a second server, it is further submitted that the computer program products of claims 29 and 30 are patentable over Williams in view of Bachman. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 29 and 30 as obvious.

Favourable reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,
Nortel Networks Limited

By: _____

Colin C. Climie, Regn. No. 56,036

Place: Toronto, Ontario, Canada
Date: August 1, 2007
Tele No.: 416-868-1482